

are involved in their children's education and collaborate with staff members to ensure achievement. Parent volunteer records document that over 3,337 hours were volunteered to assist students, programs and special events last year. Volunteer activities included collaborating with staff members in planning and evaluating programs in a shared decision making process, serving as chairs or members of committees, such as safe schools team, SSC, advisories, and supervising field trips, serving at the snack bar, correcting reports, and publishing newsletters.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I congratulate Central Union Elementary, a California Distinguished School. The students and faculty of this school exemplify a care for the community and a dedication to hard work. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Central Union Elementary many more years of success.

**KEN STARR SHOULD REPORT:
CASE CLOSED**

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial on Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's investigation which appeared this month in the three "Greater Niagara Newspapers" published in my district in Western New York: The Niagara Gazette (Niagara Falls); The Union Sun & Journal (Lockport); and The Journal-Register (Medina). Among other things, the editorial faults Kenneth Starr for his failure to submit an interim report to Congress, as required by law. If, after three years and \$40 million, Mr. Starr has been unable to find any substantial and credible information about possible crimes by the president, the editorial concludes, "Starr's report should start and end with the phrase, 'Case closed.'"

The editorial follows:

WRITE A CLOSING CHAPTER

What has Special Prosecutor Kenneth Starr been up to lately in his \$40 million quest to nail President Clinton on charges of being a Democrat? You won't find out from him. The special prosecutor won't deliver an interim report on his publicly funded wild goose chase.

Spokesman Charles Bakaly said Starr will report to Congress only if and when he has "substantial and credible information about possible crimes by the president." It may be a cold day in hell before that happens. Any claim Starr had on credibility expired about three years and \$30 million ago.

The obligation to file such a report is written right into the independent counsel law under which Starr was appointed. But there's no time element in the requirement. Oops, it looks as if Starr is riding that loophole into the sunset. His method of choice for reporting apparently is well-orchestrated leaks to the media.

Starr began his quest for a crime to pin on Clinton by investigating "Whitewater," a series of Arkansas land deals the president and Mrs. Clinton were involved in. He found no evidence of criminal wrongdoing by the Clintons.

Attorney General Janet Reno helped Starr turn his attention and the taxpayers' money to an inquiry into the president's relation-

ship with former White House intern Monica Lewinsky. Our question is, does the public need or want to know anything about the president's private affairs or lack thereof? We say no. It's Hillary Rodham Clinton's call on whether to investigate such matters, and questions about marital fidelity are best handled by private, not public investigators.

It's long past time for the American public to refuse to pay for Starr's attack dogs to nip at Clinton's heels. The special prosecutor role has become an excuse to find some dirt on a president the opposition political party wishes hadn't been elected. Get over it.

If there's no substantial and credible information by now, Starr's report should start and end with the phrase, "Case closed."

**IN RECOGNITION OF PAUL E.
GOULDING**

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, in last month's Financial Executive magazine a featured interview with Paul E. Goulding, a management consultant to businesses large and small, focused on procurement of Federal contracts. Mr. Goulding, who is a constituent of mine and an expert in procurement issues, has had broad experience in the field of government contracting in a long distinguished career that includes senior executive positions in Federal service as well as the private sector.

As an Administrative Assistant to Senator Claiborne Pell, he worked closely with Rhode Island businesses, advising and assisting them in obtaining Federal contracts. While Deputy and Acting Administrator of the General Services Administration in 1979 and 1980, he developed an 8 point program to cut operating costs at GSA. And as a Professional Staff member of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, he conducted the first comprehensive study of the Senate's major operations, including how to improve its procurement procedures.

Mr. Goulding has, in fact, played active roles as advocate, administrator, and advisor in the government procurement process. First, as a congressional staff member in assisting the business community in our state of Rhode Island. Secondly, as head of the largest non-defense agency buying goods and services for the government. Lastly, as a consultant to major international corporations as well as to small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit this interview to be included in the RECORD as part of my remarks. Mr. Goulding has offered some worthwhile and common sense advice for companies who are seeking to do business with the Federal government:

[From FEI News, May/June 1998]

Q&A: MAKING UNCLE SAM YOUR CUSTOMER

Financial Executive recently interviewed Paul E. Goulding, a Washington, D.C.-based consultant and expert in the arcane art of government procurement.

Q: Your firm has helped clients obtain more than \$30 billion in government contracts during the last 10 years, companies like AT&T and Hewlett Packard. Do large companies have a big advantage when it comes to selling to Uncle Sam?

PEG: While you might assume they would, my experience indicates that isn't the case. For instance, some big companies get involved in bidding on major contracts and find they are lost because their marketing people, who want to make the sale, are saying one thing while their government relations people have an entirely different view of what should be submitted in the bid.

A dilemma for top management?

PEG: Exactly. Some small niche companies, on the other hand, know exactly what their market is and how best to sell to it. Each case is different and there is no cookie-cutter formula. I keep an open mind and try to evaluate each situation as I see it.

Although small and medium-sized firms frequently need more help steering through the process, they are often more successful than larger companies because they tend to be more flexible and less bureaucratic when faced with complex challenges.

Why should firms of any size bother to do business with the U.S. government given all the red tape involved?

PEG: When I hear that question, I tell the story of the businessman who buys a hardware store after moving to a small town. He asks his new employees who the biggest hardware customer in town is. He is surprised to learn that the customer isn't doing business with his store. When the owner asks why not, his employees say the customer is difficult to do business with and requires that a lot of forms be filled out. I point out that same customer is probably very wealthy, doesn't bounce his checks and usually does repeat business when satisfied. That's the type of customer the federal government can be.

Just how big a customer is the U.S. government?

PEG: The U.S. government buys goods and services valued at over \$200 billion. That makes Uncle Sam the biggest customer in the world. And it's not just the dollar figure that's large, but the number of individual acquisitions. According to the GSA Procurement Data Center, over 20 million individual contract actions are processed every year.

Now that we're in a global economy and even small businesses are entering the overseas export market, and given all the problems in dealing with tariffs, quotas, foreign currency exchange, international letters of credit and shipping, it doesn't make sense for U.S. companies to fail to maximize their U.S. government business, which is right on their doorstep.

What would you advise firms that want to do business with the government?

PEG: It will require an investment of time, money and resources. Starting a relationship with the government is very similar to a company entering a new market overseas. The company has to make a commitment to the market. Sometimes companies will ask me why they can't just go after one contract and see how they do. Well, that system is just about as effective as the guy who goes to the race track and bets on one race to see if he's going to win that day.

Like any start-up marketing effort, the company has to be willing to allocate manpower and resources to help develop their government business.

What would you advise a company that already does some business with the government?

PEG: I would first ask what percentage of the domestic U.S. market the firm services. If you answer 10 percent, then I would ask what percentage of the government market for your product you control. If the answer is 5 percent, then at the very least you need to double your government sales.

What else do you tell a new client looking to grab government business?